

that, at the very least, a new treatment can further extend the life of these men and women. Rather than removing the waiting period for those with one specific disease, we should remove the waiting period for those who suffer from any of a small select group of conditions that have no cure and have the shortest life expectancies. There is no reason we cannot help those who suffer from ALS and these other conditions. We can walk and chew gum at the same time. We can protect victims of ALS and these other conditions as well.

The bill, as written, sets the stage for only those diseases that have the most recognition and, to put it bluntly, the most fundraising backing to fund bill sponsors, and it would set at a disadvantage the conditions that are far more rare and underfunded. Who will be the voice for the men and women who suffer from those diseases? Who will fight for them? Adding similarly cruel maladies to this list takes nothing away from ALS, and it can make all the difference in the world for Americans suffering from similar disabilities.

I had hoped to offer my broader approach as an amendment, but after months and months of working with the Social Security Administration and with the Congressional Budget Office, I was, unfortunately, given incomplete information at the time an agreement was reached on scheduling a vote on this bill. I appreciate Senator CORTON's and Senator BRAUN's patience in allowing me to work towards a fix while they remain committed to advancing their legislation, for which I commend them.

Additionally, while I would have hoped that my work with the Social Security Administration and the Congressional Budget Office could have gone more quickly, I do appreciate their efforts to address my questions and compile the necessary information and tools to estimate my amendment's fiscal impact.

While I was pleased to see Senator GRASSLEY's amendment, which at least would have paid for the removal of the waiting period for ALS, I will continue to work on legislation that will remove the waiting period for diseases that meet a set of criteria—no known cure with a life expectancy of less than 5 years—while not further jeopardizing the solvency of the disability insurance program. It will be ready for introduction soon.

My concerns and efforts have not been about waiving the SSDI waiting period for those who tragically suffer from ALS. I certainly agree that we ought to improve the time that they have left. But picking and choosing favorites among those with comparable conditions is not the right way to go about it. The lives of the men and women who suffer from other very similar conditions are just as valuable, and we should be a voice for them, too.

FAIRNESS FOR HIGH-SKILLED IMMIGRANTS ACT OF 2019

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1044 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1044) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Lee substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2690) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. LEE. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 1044), as amended, was passed.

Mr. LEE. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO ROB BISHOP

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to honor my friend and colleague, Congressman ROB BISHOP. After 18 years of service in the U.S. House of Representatives, he has decided to hang up his gloves and embark on his well-deserved retirement.

ROB BISHOP has served Utah's First Congressional District with integrity, tenacity, humility, and humor, and it is my high privilege to have worked with him over the last 10 years and, in the process, to have become his friend.

Born and raised in Kaysville, UT, ROB has been a lifelong resident of Utah's First Congressional District, with the exception of the 2-year mission where he lived in Germany while representing the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He graduated from Davis High School with high honors and later graduated magna

cum laude from the University of Utah with a degree in political science.

The embodiment of a public servant, ROB began his career as a high school teacher at Ben Lomond High School and Box Elder High School, teaching courses in German, AP U.S. history and government, and coaching debate. He notoriously had one rule in the classroom: I am never wrong. That might tell you something about ROB BISHOP.

An avid lover of musicals, he was active in community theater, where he happened to have met his wife Jeralynn. They first met on the production of "South Pacific" at the Palace Playhouse, and they later starred together as the prince and princess in a production of "Once Upon a Mattress." In their real-life love story, they have five children—Shule, Jarom, Zenock, Maren, and Jashon, with spouses Melissa, Kristin, Shalise, and Courtney, as well as nine grandchildren.

Inspired in his public service by Barry Goldwater, he was also involved in local politics from a young age, working at various levels of government and of the Republican Party. He has gone from being a precinct chair to a member of the Republican National Committee and from being vice chair of the Davis County Teenage Republican Club to the adviser to the Utah Teenage Republicans in 1996. Starting in 1997, he served two terms as chairman of the Utah Republican Party.

At just 25, he was elected to the Utah House of Representatives when he was known for always wearing sweaters and no socks. He served in the State legislature for 16 years and, during the last 2 years, having been unanimously elected, served as speaker of the house of representatives.

In 2002, after serving in the State legislature and having spent 28 years of teaching, he decided to serve at the national level. As ROB BISHOP said in one of his most popular campaign slogans: "Utah has plenty of Bishops—send this one to Washington!"

ROB has faithfully devoted his life to representing Utah's First Congressional District, and he has been doing that ever since making that critical decision to run for Congress.

I remember one of the first times I worked with him when ROB was a relatively new Member of Congress and I was serving at the time as general counsel to then-Governor Jon Huntsman. At the time, a private fuel storage organization was trying to store spent nuclear fuel rods in above-ground storage casks along the Wasatch Front corridor, just miles from Utah's major metropolitan area and just under the low-altitude flight path of fighter jets flying between Hill Air Force Base to the Utah Test and Training Range.

Out of all of the Members of Utah's congressional delegation at the time, all of whom, I would adhere, were similarly opposed to this proposal to store spent nuclear fuel in this particular place in this particular way—our congressional delegation was united in

that regard—but ROB BISHOP stood out as one who was particularly concerned about it and was particularly determined to prevent such a dangerous idea from taking place.

Congressman BISHOP had a full understanding of the problem, and he had a complete mastery of the scientific facts of the issue, and he had detailed, helpful ideas about how to address it. He also understood the significant and long-lasting potential ramifications that this plan could have had for Hill Air Force Base and the Utah Test and Training Range.

Thanks to ROB BISHOP's vision, direction, and determination, he developed a strategy and worked hard to implement that strategy and eventually worked to pass a bill designating the area in question as wilderness—creating a wilderness curtain around the designated storage area—making it impossible for the storage plant to be completed. ROB BISHOP thus successfully prevented spent nuclear fuel rods from coming to Utah and being stored in a particularly unsafe way and in an unsafe place close to Utah's major population center.

Though relatively new to Congress at the time, ROB was punching way above his weight. Why? Well, because he is awesome and because he was willing to dive into the nitty-gritty details of an issue and put in the hard work, not knowing and, frankly, not even caring who got the credit. ROB BISHOP just wanted to get it done. That is who ROB BISHOP is, that is how he serves, and that is why we love him. That has characterized ROB BISHOP's entire time in Congress: doggedly, thoughtfully, and honestly working for Utahns' best interests, and never really caring much who got the attention.

He served on the Armed Services Committee, the powerful House Rules Committee, and the Science Committee. As both chair and ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, he chaired hearings with his characteristically witty quips and wry jokes. He has also chaired the Congressional Western Caucus, served on the House German Caucus for his whole tenure, including for 2 years as chair, and he helped found the 10th Amendment Task Force.

When Speaker of the House John Boehner created committees for congressional reform, ROB BISHOP was named chairman of the Committee for Procedural Reform and, later on, leader of the Rules group. Under Speaker Paul Ryan, he was named chair of the Federalism Committee. ROB did all this in addition to being a staunch advocate for the military and, in particular, for Hill Air Force Base.

One of his proudest achievements was getting an extension of the Michaels airstrip at the Dugway Proving Ground in Tooele County. When he was told that there was no funding for it to be attained at the Federal level, he successfully got the Utah State Legislature to appropriate the funding to

make it happen. He was instrumental in establishing Falcon Hill, an aerospace research park just outside of Hill Air Force Base and a public-private partnership between the Air Force, the State of Utah, and private developers that was the first of its kind anywhere in the country and a model of many more like it to come.

ROB has also brought his love of baseball with him to Washington. A huge admirer of Mickey Mantle and Ernie Banks, ROB is known to have actual dirt from the pitcher's mound at Yankee Stadium in his Washington, DC, office. He has been a long-time supporter of the Salt Lake Bees, even championing the construction of their stadium while he was in the State legislature, and he is a diehard Cubs fan. Every year, he dons a uniform himself, leading his office in the intramural baseball league on Capitol Hill, with their team name known as the "Raucus Caucus."

ROB has brought the same passion he has for baseball to serving his constituents. He has, for years, worked with the Close Up Foundation to bring high school students to Washington, and he has partnered with teachers and students to put on an AP government conference every year.

He has famously led constituent and student groups on long, expert nighttime tours of the Capitol Building. In fact, he is known as the guy who gives the very best Capitol tours in all of Washington, and he has consistently spent hours upon hours late into the night making personal phone calls to each constituent who writes in to his office.

One of my favorite things about ROB BISHOP is precisely how understated and down to Earth and often self-deprecating he is. It is a true feat when you have been in Congress as long as he has and accomplished as many things as he has.

While he is known for his sharp three-piece suits here in Washington, I can't count the number of plane rides I have taken with ROB BISHOP where he shows up on the plane actually wearing gym shorts, sandals, and a hoodie. In fact, basically every time, he has given me the sage advice not to torture myself wearing a suit while on a 4-hour plane ride.

In fact, just the other day—just this week, as we were flying from Salt Lake City to Washington, DC, he commended me for finally having gotten the memo. At least this time, as he noted, I wasn't wearing a suit, although he derided me a little bit for not wearing shorts.

But when you have a conversation with ROB BISHOP, you never feel that he is trying to advance his own agenda or gain attention or fanfare. As a matter of fact, it is quite the opposite. It feels like a real conversation with a real goal to fix a problem. He simply tells it like it is—an altogether rare, refreshing, and much needed quality on Capitol Hill.

When ROB ran for Congress, he said it was his goal to make Congress less

powerful when he left than it was when he came. In all of his time here, he sought to put power in Washington back in the hands of Utahns and back in the hands of people across the country in their respective States. Just so, in all his time here, he slept on either an air mattress or on a futon so that he wouldn't get too comfortable, so that he would never feel too "at home" in Congress.

Rare is the person who can come to change Washington but not ever be changed by Washington. ROB BISHOP has managed to do just that. He has made a real difference for the people of Utah and the people of the United States of America.

It has been a distinct pleasure to call him a friend and a colleague, and I have to say I am going to miss ROB BISHOP's service here in Washington. Just the same, we have all benefited and we will all continue to benefit for many decades to come from what he has done here, who he has been here, and what he has stood for here so valiantly and consistently and faithfully and with such great decency and humility.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

COMMUNICATIONS DECENCY ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, there is a rather complicated issue that is out there that not many people are aware of. It emanates from back in 1996 with the passage of something called the Communication Decency Act.

Just a few weeks before the 2020 election, Twitter did what was previously unthinkable: It suppressed a long-standing, legitimate news outlet—that was the New York Post—from sharing an article either publicly or privately it deemed unfavorable to Presidential candidate Joe Biden. Obviously, they were concerned about Joe Biden, and they were using this act to suppress information that may not have been favorable. That is not what is supposed to happen, what it is supposed to do. To make it worse, they suspended an account of the Post—that is a major news outlet—for over 24 hours.

While other big tech entities suppressed the story as well, the depths of Twitter's censorship reached new heights, telling users that sharing the article could be "potentially harmful." There is no criteria to determine what is potentially harmful; they just decided—it is a liberal mindset, and they want to punish people who are not sharing their mindset.

Contrast that with the refusal to moderate any comments made by Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, who called Israel a "cancerous growth" to be "uprooted and destroyed" and for the "elimination of the Zionist regime" through "firm, armed resistance" despite having a policy against hateful conduct and glorifying violence. That is what they did. Those are the words. That is what they did.

Yet it proves what President Trump has been talking about for a long period of time on social media. Look what they have done to him over the last 4 years.

It is time to make sure that Twitter and other social media platforms are held accountable for engaging in censorship by repealing section 230 of the Communications Decency Act. Now, that sounds a little complicated. The Communications Decency Act—we know why it was started, but we know times have changed, and now it has turned into a very liberal political organization.

For over 20 years, social media platforms have benefited from protectionism unprecedented in the modern era—a complete liability shield protecting them from how they moderate or censor content posted for their users. To add insult to injury, there is no one to check the partisan censorship of these social media platforms. Instead, they are coddled by section 230's "Good Samaritan" provision, which allows "good-faith" efforts to restrict objectionable material. But the problem is, they are the ones who decide what is objectionable.

We all know Jesus's parable of the Good Samaritan. The moral imperative that comes from the parable has guided many legislative protections for those seeking to do good—doctors responding to problems with people in midair. I can remember many times I was involved as a volunteer pilot helping to get people medical care. People who are trying to do the right thing. We know that is significant. We know that is what the history was supposed to be on this section, section 230. It was intended to make sure that Twitter could flag and remove unquestionably harmful content, like ISIS and their propaganda videos.

In the case of the social media platforms, however, it amounts to nothing more than the fox guarding the henhouse. Instead of focusing on moderation to protect users from death threats or harassment and to prevent criminal behavior, Twitter is allowed to determine what is "otherwise objectionable" and censor it from the platform, with no right to appeal and no transparency. I mean, where else can you go in America and find someone who is totally immune from that type of behavior? You can't. It doesn't exist.

This is a case in point. Last year, they kowtowed to the Chinese Communist Party by removing the accounts of more than 100 dissidents ahead of the 30th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre. I remember that well. I remember where I was when that happened. But they didn't want people to know that type of thing actually went on, and that was somehow objectionable.

Twitter's censorship and actions over the past few years make it clear it has decided that President Trump is objectionable, and they decide that they are just going to act accordingly. That is

not surprising when you look at the employee culture they have in that media.

Here is the problem with section 230. According to a strict interpretation of the 1996 law, that is allowed. Partisan censorship is allowed. Senator RON WYDEN even admitted that, when written, section 230 wasn't about neutrality or protecting the free marketplace of ideas on platforms.

Clearly, we need to completely overhaul section 230, and the best way to do it is just repeal it. Repeal the whole thing. That is what the President wants to do. Then you could start over again and build up.

Times have changed. The argument we hear against reforming alone or repealing would be that any changes to section 230 would give social media platforms like Twitter greater control over content on their platforms. They are not wrong, but that argument ignores the fact that censorship is already happening for Americans due to their political beliefs, in violation of the First Amendment—it is supposed to protect people—without any transparency or recourse.

Others believe in the need to reform 230 incrementally, but those solutions are merely band-aids on a bullet wound. We have seen the negative impact of incremental reforms. They just don't work. A good example: Efforts to hold users accountable for information by requiring a "real name" associated with an account has seen Native Americans blocked from platforms for using their legal names.

Social media platforms and supporters of section 230's last-ditch argument is to tell conservative voices to create their own social media platforms since they clearly aren't welcome in those that are existing today. That sounds good, except that the problem is that Twitter and others have a de facto monopoly on social media. House Democrats agree. They wrote a 400-plus page report arguing Big Tech constitutes a monopoly.

Just remember the internet, what it was like back in 1996. In 1996, only 20 million Americans had access to the internet—only 20 million Americans in 1996. Today, 313 million Americans have access. So now it is a way of life.

The reality is that section 230 is simply outdated for today's usage and is a strong case for why all laws should sunset. One of the problems I have with laws that are passed is that they can be passed, the problem is corrected that caused the laws to be passed, but the laws stay on the books. That is exactly what has happened with this.

Section 230 is outdated and needs to be changed. Otherwise, we will find ourselves here time and again, forced to rectify decades-old laws with modern technology and ideas.

Let me simplify. Section 230 allows Twitter and other liberal social media companies to be exempt from liability—there is no accountability whatsoever—for what their users say. For ex-

ample, Twitter can't be held responsible for someone who posts a death threat against me, and I understand that. That is where we are today. But they are also protected from what they censor even if it is in violation of the First Amendment or it is protected speech. No one else has this shield. No one else in society has this, which is why President Trump is right. We need a total repeal.

If you look at what they had done to President Trump over the last 4 years, you will know exactly what I am talking about. But the place for repeal is not the Defense authorization bill.

There is an idea that the Defense authorization bill for 60 years in a row now has passed, and so everybody who has something that doesn't pass normally, they try to put it on as an amendment—having nothing to do with the military and having nothing to do with our defense system for the ensuing year. So that is how this one was decided. They put this on. The problem is, if it had that language repealing it, we would not have a defense bill. So there is not a choice in this case. We need a place for repealing section 230, and we need to do it.

The NDAA is about making sure that our troops are cared for. It is for our kids in the field. They are the ones we are supporting. They are the ones who need us. If we don't have this Defense authorization bill passed by December 31, our pilots are not going to get flight pay; the kids are not going to get hazard pay. The whole thing will fall apart.

Just think about the problems we are having in the military. One of the big problems is—and the Presiding Officer recognizes this because he is on this committee—right now, our big problem is how to get more pilots into the Air Force, into the services. They can't do it because of the competition out there. We can't compete with the private sector. Now, if we take away their flight privileges, then it could be goodbye to most of our pilots.

We just need to get this thing done. It should not be on the Defense bill. I want to make this appeal to make sure that no one has the idea that the National Defense Authorization Act is the place to have it.

I give the President and my colleagues my commitment that I will do everything possible to work toward a complete repeal of section 230 through other means. It has to happen. President Trump is right. Total repeal is the only answer if we are going to make sure we get this thing done—not on the bill, not on the Defense authorization bill, but in any of the other vehicles that come along. It has to be done.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I think it is important that we acknowledge what is going on right now. What is going on is that the most significant vote of the year is taking place. It is called the Defense authorization bill, the NDAA. It has passed every year for 60 years now. This will be the 60th year it is passed. Nothing else has a record like that.

Yet there is always trauma at the tail end, and the reason there is trauma is that everyone knows it is going to pass—and it is going to pass—so anything they can't pass during the normal process of the year, for any number of reasons, they try to put on this as an amendment. Some things are not acceptable because they have the effect of killing the bill.

Now, we have two people who have been working with the committees putting this thing together. I know that the Presiding Officer knows this, but these people have worked an entire year and many, many more than half the weekends. People have this idea that people don't work in Washington on causes. They do on this one.

John Bonsell in my office has been the director, the support of the bill, with Liz King on the Democratic side. They have worked hand in hand together. People talk about how Democrats and Republicans fight with each other. Not on this bill. We all support it. We all want it. We all want to make sure it is done and it is done right.

So we have a defense authorization bill. It will be the largest one that we have had in the history of the Defense authorization bills. It is one that, without it, we are not going to be able to take care of our kids in the field.

We have to remember that, while there are a lot of hitchhikers on this bill on causes that we have determined to be worthwhile causes, we don't do it if it is going to be something that will take down the bill. So we want to make sure that nothing would jeopardize passing the Defense authorization bill.

Now, the key is December 31 of this year. If we don't have the bill passed by December 31 of this year, I mentioned that we have problems, that any of the specialist groups—and I talk about the pilots; I talk about those involved in hazard occupations—the SEALs—the individuals who are out there risking their lives to a greater extent than others do in the military. And they are out there doing it for this reason, and we want to make sure that they are willing to take these risks. We want to make sure that we are taking good care of people.

I run into people all the time who say: You are always so concerned about our military. Yet the chief competition that we have is with whom: Russia and China? Russia and China actually, after the last administration—that was the Obama administration. In the last

5 years—that would be from 2010 to 2015—he knocked down the military budget by 25 percent. It had never happened before—not since World War II anyway. Yet we found ourselves in a situation where we couldn't compete.

Now, they will argue with you, and they will say: Well, we spend more money on defense than Russia and China put together. That is true, but there is a big difference, and that is that in Communist countries they don't care about taking care of their troops. Our job is to make sure that our kids have a prosperous career. They want to defend their country, but they also have families. They have to take care of their families.

Housing has been a huge problem in the military, so we want to make sure that we have good housing for our troops—not just here in the United States but around the world—and we are doing that.

Now, in Communist countries they give them a gun and say: Go out and kill people. They don't care about the troops. They don't spend any of that money.

So the largest expense, the largest ticket on running a military operation is taking care of the people. So that is why it is important that people understand this.

There is also a document that nobody reads anymore. It is called the Constitution. You read that and say: What are we supposed to be doing in Washington? We get involved in so many different things. Yet, when you read the Constitution, it says that our primary concern should be to defend against an outside enemy, and then other areas—transportation and a few other areas—are mentioned. But the No. 1 concern is that we have to have a military that is second to none. We want to make sure.

Let me say this about our President. When he first came into office, President Trump recognized what had happened to our military and had recognized that there are things like hypersonic—that is a very recent, modern technology that they are working on in China and Russia and other places, and we are actually behind them at this time.

People assume that America has better everything in the military than China has and Russia has, and that is not true. They have artillery systems that are better than the artillery systems that we currently have.

So we have a job that I consider to be the most significant job—significant job for the defense of our country, and it is just that: to defend our country.

I want to applaud all of these people who work long hours. We are now to the point where they are what they call turning the page. We are ready to pass a bill. We are in the process of getting signatures from the committees.

There are a lot of people who don't like the idea of having to sign a bill and sign on to a bill, yet they know that in order to maintain a superior position over China and Russia, we

have to do that, and we have to show our superiority, and we have to make it last. That is what we are doing right now. It is a very significant time.

I anticipate that we are going to be able to get this done, and I applaud the President for the time that he has spent and the money that he has spent on rebuilding our military. You hear him say all the time that we now have the strongest military that we have ever had and we are in great shape. But we are still rebuilding. We still have areas where our adversaries have better equipment than we do.

So that is what is going on today. That is what is taking place. It is a very proud time that we can say that we are now addressing those things that are the most significant things going on in Washington today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the postcloture time on the Waller nomination expire at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination; I further ask that if cloture is invoked on the Hardy nomination, the postcloture time expire at 1:45 p.m. tomorrow and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination; finally, that if any of the nominations are confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALS DISABILITY INSURANCE ACCESS ACT OF 2019

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offset the costs to the Social Security's disability insurance trust fund associated with S. 578. Eventhough my amendment did not gain the 60 vote threshold, I want my colleagues to know that you just can't tap into the Social Security disability trust funds without dire future consequences.